Place-Names in -*wich*:
A Preliminary Linguistic Survey

Ann Dornier

INTRODUCTION

As the title implies, this communication is a statement of work in progress. This is not a modest disclaimer: I offer suggestions not pronouncements. Furthermore, I invite constructive criticism.[1]

The generic -*wich* represents a palatalized form of the OE noun *wīc*, a loanword from Latin *vicus*. The *c* is palatalized in Old English by the preceding front vowel, but in certain plural cases (e.g., dative plural *wīcum*) is velarized by the following back vowel.

I am concerned with the palatalized forms only, although they cannot be studied without some reference to the velarized ones. (By definition, *Wich*- names are excluded from this present survey.) For dialectal reasons, the study is currently confined to the area south of the Ribble-Humber line.

Wīc, in common with many other place-name elements, raises two interrelated questions: one is linguistic, the other is historical. The linguistic one must be considered primary, in that historical inferences are in part dependent on the establishment of place-name forms. Thus, although I am currently working on the historical dimension, this preliminary survey is deliberately confined to linguistic matters.

The pioneer study of these palatalized forms is in Ekwall's monograph on all forms of *wīc* place-names.[2] It was a magisterial work which still commands respect, but over twenty years later a re-appraisal is clearly due.

As regards sources, I have started with Ekwall's data.[3] I have checked the relevant available EPNS county volumes, but at this preliminary stage they are only noted if they provide information additional to Ekwall. Other works are duly referenced.

GENDER AND CASE

1. The gender and declension of OE *wīc* are somewhat problematic. Latin *vicus* is masculine (second declension). Ekwall could identify only one example of masculine *wīc*, and this occurs in a Biblical context, not as an OE toponym.[4] One has to

remember, however, that it is not always possible to determine gender.

It would appear that OE *wīc* was, at least in origin, a strong neuter noun. Thus palatalization would be retained in all cases of the singular. The nominative and accusative plural would remain palatalized if the form was uninflected, but it would be velarized if the form was the inflected one *wīcu*. According to Wrander, *wīc* was the norm and *wīcu* irregular and late.[5]

There would appear to be a difference of opinion as regards the feminine noun. Ekwall apparently gave it equal weighting, and implied a declension comparable to the neuter in terms of the palatalization of the singular cases and the nominative or accusative plural.[6] Wrander asserts that the feminine is a late occurrence and a weak noun, giving rise to the adoption of nominative and accusative plural *wīcan*.[7]

2.   The fact that palatalized *wīc* can be either singular or plural clearly raises the problem of grammatical number. In some cases it is possible to determine number, but unfortunately in many others it is not (see section (d), below). In a few cases Latin *vicus* has been substituted for *wīc* or added as a gloss. It is difficult, however, to decide whether the usage of the Latin singular necessarily indicates an OE singular.

If Wrander is correct about the late adoption of *wīcu* and *wīcan* (though he nowhere defines what he means by late), there could be chronological implications in the usage of the palatalized plural forms. A factor, however, which could obviate such a generalized scheme is regional or dialectal variation.

COMPOSITION OF THE GAZETTEER

1.   The accompanying Gazetteer (see below) is a preliminary working list. At some future stage some entries may be deleted and others added. Inevitably, given the deficiency of the data, a question-mark will always hang over some of the putative examples. I have started in the main from what may seen an unscholarly basis, namely modern palatalized pronunciation, and then worked backwards.

Initially I have struck out those which are known or deemed to have a different derivation. Thus those in which the element is OE *wisc* 'meadow' have been excluded. I have also omitted those in which the element is taken to be OE *wice* 'wych-elm'; although I do wonder whether some of these should be reconsidered as possible dative singular examples of *wīc*. The proposed etymology of Wychough (Cheshire) highlights this question.[8]

I have jettisoned those modern *-wick* names which Ekwall included solely on the basis that from the mid- to late thirteenth century the orthography *-ch* does indicate a genuine palatalized form.[9] I am not convinced that this is always so, and in default of corroborative evidence I am inclined to omit them at this stage.

I have accepted that Anglo-Norman, and later, *-z* (sometimes *-s*) does represent a palatalized pronunciation of OE final *c*. Indeed, at present it would appear to be the most important indicator. (The absence of this form in the extant records, however, does not in itself exclude a particular place, given that medieval records are frequently deficient.) Clearly in attested instances one has to be sure that the element is *wīc*. (This orthography also represents OE *wisc*. Furthermore, there is the possible complication of a misreading of *(m)ys* < Old French *mes* < Latin *mansus*.)

The orthography of OE written sources is difficult to evaluate. Most of them, even if textually genuine, are copies of a later date, and the form of the name may have been altered inadvertently by Norman-French scribes ignorant of Old English, or may have been deliberately 'updated' by scribes used to writing Middle English. Furthermore, although Anglo-Saxon coins are contemporary, their abbreviated place-name forms could be misleading.

2.   Clearly consideration must be given to the problem of lost or altered names. What follows is very much a provisional preview (see below, Gazetteer B).

Ekwall listed examples from Anglo-Saxon charters of lost names which have uninflected *wīc*: six in the singular; one in the plural; and sixteen which may be either singular or plural.[10] Their acceptability depends on two assumptions. First, that the orthography is reliable, given that most of the charters are preserved in later copies. Second, that for those which are preceded by an OE preposition the form does represent the usual form of the place-name, and is not merely observing the rules of declension. This applies particularly to those which occur as landmarks in charter bounds. In the one certain plural example, *þornwic* (Hants), there is in the same charter bounds both *(on)* *þornwic* and *(of) þornwycan* (*BCS* 1200; Sawyer 754).[11] I assume that a 'free-standing' place-name would have a 'fixed' form in the nominative, accusative or dative, and that, if it had been in the dative, this would have been 'fossilized' in the basic name-form irrespective of any syntactical case endings. Thus provisionally I accept these as palatalized *wīc* names. (If the implication of alternating forms is that the form of the actual place-name was

fluid, this opens a can of worms with regard to phonological classification. Clearly this possibility will have to be given further consideration.)

As regards other lost names, at present I have only two possible or probable examples. The first is *Cepmundewiche* (Cheshire), probably somewhere in the environs of Peover Superior, attested in 1086 (GDB, fo. 267v; Cheshire 20/7).[12] The second is *Schesewys*, first recorded in Cheshire in the fourteenth century as a field name.[13] *Cheswis* was the name of a local family. It is a reasonable assumption that in origin it was a place-name. It may be a genuinely lost place-name in Cheshire. I am tempted, however, to suggest Seswick (Flintshire) as the origin of the family and thus of the field name, given the interrelationship of settlement between these contiguous areas before and after 1066, particularly in the district of Maelor in which Seswick is located.[14] The 1086 name which probably represents later Seswick is *Chespuic* (GDB, fo. 268r; Cheshire 27/3).[15]

Today there is a place in Wiltshire which has the alternating names Chaddenwick and Charnage; Chadwick (Warwickshire) has a thirteenth-century form with final -*z*; and Gotwick, Hazelwick and Lydwyke (Sussex) have OE uninflected forms. These could indicate post-1066 accidental confusion between palatalized and velarized forms. Such possible confusion in later times should not be underestimated, and one of the implications may be that, in localities where the velarized form was common, a genuine but isolated palatalized form was completely ousted and has disappeared.

There is a second possible reason for the existence of alternating forms and the subsequent dominance of the velarized form, namely the 'late' OE predilection for nominative and accusative plural *wicu/wican*, which may eventually have ousted some of the palatalized plurals. Strudgwick Wood (Sussex) has an OE charter form *Strodwic* and a mid-twelfth-century form *Strodewica*; the latter suggests a form -*wican* with the not uncommon loss of final -*n*.

In theory there is another possible reason for the displacement of an original palatalized *wīc*, namely Old Norse sound-substitution. However, given the lack of Anglo-Saxon charters from the key areas of the East Midlands, this is well-nigh impossible to demonstrate.

It is also possible that in some cases -*tūn* has replaced an earlier palatalized *wīc*. 'Hammwic' is a possible though controversial case.[16] 'Lundenwic' is another possibility. If the lost *Werburging/Werburge wic* is by any chance Warbleton (Sussex),[17] this would be another instance.

Finally it must be borne in mind that some *wīc* place-names may have been completely renamed, and thus have disappeared without trace.

3. Even if one accepts only a percentage of these place-names, whether modern, lost or altered, it is clear that, although there are observable clusters, the examples are widely dispersed over the area under consideration. (There is an apparent void in the East Midlands; but this may indeed be more apparent than real, see section 2 above; and furthermore I have not yet investigated this region for -*z* orthography.)

It has also emerged that modern -*wick* may mask earlier palatalized *wīc* (though it has to be acknowledged that in most cases this will be impossible to prove).

FIRST ELEMENTS AND GRAMMATICAL NUMBER

1. Next I will consider the first element in the compound names (excluding in the main those added to 1086 simplex names). In some cases the etymology is obscure, and thus only possibilities can be suggested. I have divided them into four groups: those with singular *wīc*; those which Ekwall would appear to class as singular on grounds of general probability; the plural names; and those for which the grammatical number is uncertain.

(a) *Singular*

In Fordwich, Greenwich, *Hammwic*, Ipswich and Sandwich the first element is topographical: respectively 'ford', 'green', 'land almost surrounded by water', a river name and 'sand'. The same is probably true of *Rugawic* and *Sihterwic*: respectively 'rough' and 'ditch or drain'. The first element of *Wiwarawic* means 'the people of Wye', that of *Ealdan wic* 'old', and that of Norwich 'north'. The first elements of *Lundenwic* and Dunwich are the respective Romano-British names. The first element of Swanage could be either 'swans' or '(swine)herds', but in view of its location I would suggest that swans are more likely than people associated with pigs. *Boiwic* is problematic. It looks like an OE pers.n. *Boi(a)*, but there is no apparent genitival ending (the only alternative that I can suggest at this stage is some variant of OE *boga* 'bow', which does occur as the first element in other place-names where it clearly has a topographical connotation). The first element of Parwich is equally problematic. Recently it has been discounted as a river-name, and its etymology left an open question.[18] However, there must be a strong presumption that it is either a topographical

or 'people' name. (Droit)wich, (Middle)wich, (Nant)wich, (North)wich and *Wic* are also in the singular.

(b)   *Probably Singular*

In Aldwych, Bromwich (Hants), Harwich and Ledwyche the elements are respectively 'old', 'river, stream', 'army' and a river name. Fulwich (Cheshire/Flintshire) is assumed to be 'foul, dirty'. The first element of Woolwich is 'wool, woollen goods'. Chadwich (1086 *Celdwic*) is problematic. It may be an OE pers.n. *Ceadel/Ceadala*, but I am inclined to think that it is OE *celde* 'spring', with subsequent metathesis of *l* and *d*, giving the appearance of a personal name with Anglo-Norman *-el* termination. The first element of Outwich is apparently the Norman pers.n. *Ote*. Leftwich (1086 *Wice*) has the OE pers.n. *Lēoftæt*. The first element of *Ludwyche* is uncertain.

(c)   *Plural*

The first element of *þornwic* (Hants) is OE *þorn* 'thorn-bush'. That of Powick (Worcs.) is an OE pers.n. *Pohha*; this place-name is classed as plural on the evidence of *BCS* 1282, Sawyer 786, which includes the (late OE dative plural) form *into poincgþican*.

(d)   *Singular or Plural*

The range includes environmental or topographical elements (in which I include Chaddenwick/Charnage and Chadwick — see (b) above, under Chadwich); official names ('king', 'bishop'); personal names; livestock names (? and one concerned with dairy produce — Seswick); one probably associated with trade (*Cepmundewiche*); and one associated with a clerical community (Prestwich). Only the personal names and livestock names are considered here.

(i)   Personal Names. The certain or possible personal names attested pre-1066 all occur as the first element of the names of lost places. The clearest examples are *Snodeswic* (OE *Snodd*) and *Werburging/Werburge wic* (OE *Wǣrburg*). *Willering wic*, *Cynemunding wic* and *Udding wic* are considered to contain respectively OE *Wilhere*, *Cynemund* and *Udd*. This interpretation is probably correct, but it is based on the assumption that *-ing* is a connective particle. The first element of *Subbingwic* is unknown — it could be a personal name. (That of *Hremping wic* is deemed to be topographical.[19]) Turning to the two 1086 examples, there must be a degree of doubt as to whether the first elements are really personal names. Baswich (*Bercheswic*: GDB, fo. 247r; Staffordshire 2/2; 4) may contain the OE pers.n. *Beorcol*, but alternatively it could contain OE *beorc* 'birch' with intrusive *s* (the *l* of the

twelfth-century form *Bercleswich* may be the result of the subsequent addition of the Anglo-Norman *-el* termination.) Bloxwich (*Blocheswic*: GDB, fo. 246r; Staffordshire 1/6) may be an OE pers.n. *Blocc(a)*, but such a name is not recorded independent of place-names. Of those attested only after 1086, the current position is as follows: Bagwich may contain the OE name *Bacga*; Grimsditch probably contains ON *Grímr* (though this does not mean that it is a pre-1086 formation); Gutteridge may contain an otherwise unrecorded OE pers.n. *Crust*;[20] Lottage may contain a personal name *Lott(a)* for which there is no independent pedigree; Runnage may contain the putative personal name *Roegna*.[21] In none of these cases is there any firm evidence that the first element is a personal name.

(ii)   Livestock Names. OE *cū* 'cow' is the first element of Cowage (four instances) and the genitive plural *cūna* occurs in Conrish. (Calwich may contain OE *cealf* 'calf', but one cannot rule out the possibility that the element is OE *calu* 'bald, bare'.) OE *feoh* 'cattle' is probably the first element of Fuge and Fuidge. OE *heord* 'herd, flock' is the first element of *Herdewic* and OE *oxa* (in the genitive plural *oxena*) that of *Oxena wic* and probably of Oxwich.

There is of course the question of interchangeable singular and plural forms. Ekwall cited one example, Warwick, where the majority of pre-1066 forms are plural, but there is one attested singular.[22] He argued, however, that the singular refers specifically to the *burh* and not to the settlement as a whole. If he is correct, these are not interchangeable forms in the strict sense. In one charter Fordwich is described as (*juxta*) *Fordeuuicum* (*BCS* 36; Sawyer 7), but, in the context, *-wicum* is presumably Latin accusative singular. In another charter, London is described as *in oppido . . . regali Lundoniae vicu* (*BCS* 335; Sawyer 168). Clearly the name is latinized, but *vicu* poses a problem: *vicus* is Latin second declension, not fourth, and therefore has no form *vicu*. It may be a mistake for *vico*; but, if it is an OE plural, it may not be a place-name element in this context. (The possibility that a plural form could be used in a text not as a place-name but as a noun descriptive of the quarters or suburbs of a trading centre, will be considered when I discuss the historical dimension — the data for '*Quentowic*' point in this direction.)

2.   Having considered these first elements, I would like to make the following suggestions, fully acknowledging that they are based on statistical probability:

(a)   Where *wīc* is in the singular, the first element is predominantly topographical, there is no certain personal name, and there are no domesticated livestock names (swans I include with 'wild' animals, along with badgers, etc.) or names indicative of agricultural produce. Again, where *wīc* is probably singular the first elements are mainly topographical; in the two examples with personal names, these elements are additions later than 1086, and there are no livestock or agricultural produce names (the 'wool' of Woolwich is exceptional, if not unique, in contrast to the occurrence of sheep names, and as such has an industrial and/or mercantile connotation). Thus I would suggest that the critical divide is between singular and plural forms rather than between palatalized and velarized ones *per se*. (It is perhaps worth noting in this context that the 'Northumbrian' names which are clearly singular are topographical, directional or group names.)[23]

(b)   I have implied that Anglo-Norman and later clerks erroneously perceived some OE elements as personal names, and treated or modified them accordingly. Thus I would argue that personal-name elements are rarer than they might appear at a casual glance.

(c)   The livestock names with modern palatalized *wīc* are concentrated in the south-western counties. This suggests a regional idiosyncrasy. (It is perhaps worth noting in this context that, although *cū-* does occur with other second elements in other parts of the area under consideration, there do not appear to be any examples of *cū* + *wīc* outside the south-west of it, with the exception of (Barton) Cowick (Derbys.). There is of course 'Northumbrian' Cowick.)

DATE

The possible phasing of those names coined before 1086 is left on one side for the present. What is under consideration is the question of the formation of names after 1086.

In the first place, there are the additions to existing simplexes. Droitwich, Leftwich, Middlewich, Nantwich and Northwich are clear examples. Outwich may be another.

Secondly, in some areas palatalized *wīc* may have been perceived as indicative of a particular type of settlement, and thus its usage may have been perpetuated. The clearest example of this is Shirleywich (Staffs.), founded in the seventeenth century as the centre of the Shirley family saltworks.[24]

Thirdly, there is the process of transference. Oxwich (Glamorgan) must be a transferred name no earlier than the Anglo-Norman conquest of South Wales. It has been suggested that Greenwich (Derbys.) is a transference from Greenwich (Kent).[25] Landholding or settlement fragmentation may also have led to transference within a locality (both pre- and post-1086): there is a cluster of Bromwich names in the contiguous areas of Staffs., Warks. and Worcs., of which only West Bromwich is attested in 1086, and in the thirteenth century Castle Bromwich was given the affix *Magna* and Little Bromwich that of *Parva*.

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER

GAZETTEER

Note that the counties given below are those of pre-1974 date; the component *wīc*s of Droitwich and Fulwich have been excluded; and that the number in brackets is the *Ek.W* page number.

Key to symbols:
■ = singular; ▲ = probably singular; ▼ = -*z* (-*s*) orthography;
● = OE preposition;   italic = recorded in pre-1066 source or GDB.

A. CURRENT NAMES

Aldridge ▼	Staffs. (52)
Aldwych ▲	Middx. (28)
Bagwich	Isle of Wight (48)
Baswich ▼	Staffs. (52)
Bloxwich	Staffs. (52)
Bromwich ▲	Hants (18)
Bromwich, West	Staffs. (52)
Bromwich, Castle	Warks. (51)
Bromwich, Little ▼	Warks. (51)
Bromwich, Wood	Worcs. (51)
Broomage	Devon (50)
Calwich	Staffs. (52)
Chaddenwick/Charnage ▼	Wilts. (49)
Chadwich ▲ ▼	Worcs. (51)
Chadwick ▼	Warks. (51)
Cholwich	Devon (50)
Colwich ▼	Staffs. (52)
Combwich ▼	Som. (49)
Conrish Farm ▼	Wilts. (59)
Cowage	Wilts.; Foxley (49)
Cowage	Wilts.; Hilmarton (49)
Cowage Copse	Hants (49)

Cowage Farm	Wilts.; Calne (49)
(*Droit*)*wich* ■ ▼	Worcs. (23)
Dunwich ■ ▼	Suffolk (19)
Fordwich ■ ▼	Kent (16)
Fuge	Devon (50)
Fuidge	Devon (50)
Fulwich ▲ ▼	Cheshire/Flintshire (26)
Fulwich Lane	Kent (46)
Gotwick	Sussex (33)
Gratwich ▼	Staffs. (52)
Greenwich	Derbys. (53)
Greenwich ■ ▼	Kent (17)
Greenwich	Wilts. (49)
Grimsditch Wood	Essex (48)
Gutteridge Hall ▼	Essex (48)
Hammerwich	Staffs. (52)
'*Hammwic*' ■	Hants; Southampton (17–18)
Harwich ▲ ▼	Essex (19)
Harwich Street ▲	Kent (17)
Hazelwick	Sussex (33)
Ipswich ■ ▼	Suffolk (19)
Ledwyche ▲ ▼	Salop (27)
(*Left*)*wich* ▲	Cheshire (26)
Lottage	Wilts. (49)
'*Lundenwic*' ■	Middx. (16)
Lutwyche Hall ▲ ▼	Salop (27)
Lydwicke	Sussex (33)
Markwich	Surrey (47)
(*Middle*)*wich* ■ ▼	Cheshire (25)
Milwich ▼	Staffs. (52)
(*Nant*)*wich* ■ ▼	Cheshire (25)
(*North*)*wich* ■ ▼	Cheshire (25)
Norwich ■ ▼	Norfolk (19–20)
Outwich ▲	Middx. (29)
Oxwich	Glamorgan (53)
Parwich ■ ▼	Derbys. (N. Brooks et al., loc. cit. note 18)
Powick	Worcs. (36)
Prestwich	Lancs. (53)
Runnage	Devon (50)
Sandwich ■ ▼	Kent (16)
Seswick	Flints. (M. Richards, loc. cit. note 14)
Sheldwich	Kent (46)
Strudgwick Wood	Sussex (33)
Swanage ■ ▼	Dorset (18–19)
Warwick ■	Warks. (37)
Winch ▼	Norfolk (53)
Woolwich ▲ ▼	Kent (17)

B. LOST NAMES

Æscinwic	Sussex (32)
Biscopes wic	Kent (32)
Boiwic ■ ●	Herts. (32)
Cepmundewiche ▼	Cheshire (J. McN. Dodgson, loc. cit. note 12)
Cynemunding wic	Berks (33)
Cynges wic	Sussex (32)
Ealdan wic ■ ●	Glos. (32)
Herdewic ●	Bucks. (33)
Hnuttwic ●	Hants (33)
Hremping wic	Kent (32)
Oxena wic ●	Bucks. (33)
Rugawic ■ ●	Oxon. (32)
Scacalwic	Sussex (33)
Schesewys	Cheshire (J. McN. Dodgson, loc. cit. note 13)
Sihterwic ■ ●	Sussex (32)
Snodeswic	Derbys. (33)
Subbingwic	Worcs. (33)
Þornwic ●	Hants; Havant (33)
Þornwic ●	Hants; Meon (35)
Udding wic	Bucks. (33)
Werburging/Werburge wic	? (33)
Wic ■ ●	Kent (32)
Willering wic	Bucks. (33)
Wiðig wic	Probably Sussex (33)
Wiwarawic ■ ●	Kent (32)

NOTES

Additional abbreviations

Ek.*W*	E. Ekwall, *Old English Wīc in Place-Names*, Nomina Germanica XIII (Lund, 1964).
GDB	Great Domesday Book, quoted by folio and by chapter and entry number of the following volumes of the Phillimore (Chichester) edition: XXIV J. Morris, ed., *Staffordshire* (1976); XXVI P. Morgan, ed., *Cheshire* (1978).

1. I am grateful to Dr Margaret Gelling for making encouraging noises when I discussed my preliminary observations with her; but she is in no way responsible for the contents of the present draft.
2. Ek.*W*.
3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., 12.
5. N. Wrander, *English Place-Names in the Dative Plural*, Lund Studies in English LXV (Lund, 1983), 80.
6. Ek.*W*, 11.
7. As above, note 5.
8. J. McN. Dodgson, *The Place-Names of Cheshire*, Part IV, EPNS XLVII (Cambridge, 1972), 53.
9. Ek.*W.*, *passim*.
10. Ibid., 32–3 and 35.
11. Ibid., 35.
12. J. McN. Dodgson, *The Place-Names of Cheshire*, Part II, EPNS XLV (Cambridge, 1970), 86.
13. J. McN. Dodgson, *The Place-Names of Cheshire*, Part III, EPNS XLVI (Cambridge, 1971), 317.
14. M. Richards, *Welsh Administrative and Territorial Units* (Cardiff, 1969), 197.
15. Anglo-Norman *p* is presumably masking OE 'wynn'.
16. A. Rumble, 'Hamtun alias Hamwic (Saxon Southampton): the place-name traditions and their significance' in P. Holdsworth, *Excavations at Melbourne Street, Southampton 1971–76* (London, 1980), 7–20.
17. *DEPN*, 407.
18. N. Brooks, M. Gelling, D. Johnson, 'A new charter of King Edgar', *Anglo-Saxon England* XIII (1984), 137–55.
19. J. K. Wallenberg, *Kentish Place-Names* (Uppsala, 1931), 81.
20. P. H. Reaney, *The Place-Names of Essex*, EPNS XII (Cambridge, 1935), 358.
21. J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer, F. M. Stenton, *The Place-Names of Devon,* Part I, EPNS VIII (Cambridge, 1931), 197.
22. Ek.*W*, 37.
23. Ibid., 31–2.
24. A. J. Kettle, 'Salt', *Victoria County History of Stafford,* Volume II (Oxford, 1967), 246–51.
25. K. Cameron, *The Place-Names of Derbyshire,* Part II, EPNS XXVIII (Cambridge, 1959), 495.

English Place-Names and Welsh Stress-Patterns

Hywel Wyn Owen

This article examines English place-names in Clwyd which were subject to stress-patterns of Welsh speakers. This phenomenon in the relationship between Welsh and English has already been observed in loan-words, but this is the first serious attempt at applying prosodic analysis to hitherto perplexing place-names in North-East Wales.

Discussion of English place-names in Wales has to date concentrated almost exclusively on phonology. In B. G. Charles's pioneering *Non-Celtic Place-Names in Wales*, five lines of the section 'Welsh Influence on the Development of English Place-Names'[1] merely list seven place-names subject to 'the system of Welsh accentuation'; five lines within his discussion of *Prestatyn* declare the 'name to be taken over by the Welsh and the accent shifted to the penultimate in accordance with the normal Welsh system of accentuation'.[2] Professor Melville Richards's later discussion of a dozen place-names incorporating forms not available to B. G. Charles adds to the documentary evidence and to the phonological data, but draws no attention to stress-patterns (with the exception of simply citing *Prestatyn* as 'the outstanding example' of Welsh influence).[3]

Illustrating well-established phonological features seems less pressing than examining certain prosodic features which could prove valuable in detecting similar phenomena elsewhere in Wales (and England). This article concentrates on the area selected by Melville Richards, and, in the light of stress-patterns, reinterprets some of his evidence, that of B. G. Charles, and some of my own pronouncements. Significantly these stress-patterns now make certain phonological developments less problematic. There seems to be a wider context which transcends morphological considerations. That over-riding principle is the beat, the rhythm of the word.

NATURALIZED PLACE-NAMES

My material has been drawn from that area of Clwyd in North-East Wales where distinctive place-names still mark the Mercian advance. This took place (in the seventh and eighth centuries), westwards along the coastal strip of the the Dee from